

REMARKS

Examiner Dang is thanked for his thorough examination of the Subject Patent Application. Independent Claims 1 and 16 have been made to more clearly describe this invention and in so doing clearly show distinction from Examiners cited prior art. Amended Claims 1 and 16 now describe a conductive layer, an overlying amorphous silicon layer, and a metal layer all being **formed of a single material**. However newly amended independent Claims 1 and 16 now describe an amorphous silicon layer formed **immediately after** formation of the underlying first metal or first conductive layer, **thus precluding the use or fromation of any intervening material** such as layer 206 in the Bai et al prior art. The amended independent Claims now specifically do not allow any process or layer to be placed between the underlying conductive and amorphous layer. Surely this clearly differentiates applicant's invention from the Bai et al art. Therefore reconsideration of independent Claims 1 and 16, as well as referencing dependent Claims, rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bai et al, (US 5,818,092), in view of Despande et al, (6,512,266 B1), is requested. (Examiner stated on page 17 of 09-06-2006 rejection that the term "comprising" does not exclude intervening steps such as Bai inclusion of layer 206, thus applicants newly amended independent Claims NOW excluding that layer or step).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 16, as well as the referencing dependents claims under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Chau et al (US 5,625,217 B1), in view of Nguyen et al (US 6,084,279), is again addressed via highlighted

amended independent Claim 1. No combination of the above prior art describe **an amorphous silicon shape, (formed of a single material) formed directly on underlying conductive shape (also formed of a single material) which in turn directly overlays a gate insulator layer, wherein an amorphous silicon layer used to form the amorphous silicon shape is immediately formed (without any interceding steps) on an underlying metal layer and where the amorphous silicon shape is totally consumed during silicide formation.** It is obvious the Chau prior art does not totally consume the amorphous silicon layer overlying a conductive layer, therefore only forming metal silicide on an unconsumed portion of the amorphous silicon layer. Therefore the Chau prior art will not result in the low gate resistance and no polysilicon depletion obtained via applicants process in which all high resistance material is consumed during the silicidation procedure. Therefore it is strongly believed that the Chau prior art in combination with the above referencing prior art do not lead to a process sequence in which an amorphous silicon shape, formed directly on an underlying conductive shape, (precluding the use of a insulator barrier layer), is totally consumed during the formation of an metal silicide region directly on an underlying conductive shape. Therefore reconsideration of independent Claims 1 and 16 as the referencing dependent is requested.

Therefore it is respectfully suggested that the combinations of these various references cannot be combined without reference to applicant's own invention. None of the applied references address the problem of forming a silicide layer directly on an underlying gate insulator layer wherein the components of the silicide layer an amorphous silicon layer and an underlying conductive layer were formed of a single material. Applicant has claimed his process in detail.


IME03-011CC

The processes of Figs. 1- 8 and Claims 1 - 12, 14 - 28 and 31, are both believed to be novel and patentable over these various references because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that the combination of claimed elements would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. That is to say, there must be something in the prior art or line of reasoning to suggest that the combination of these various references is desirable. We believe that there is no such basis for the combination, We therefore request Examiner Dang to reconsider his rejection in view of these arguments and the amendments to the Claims.

Dependent Claims 13, and 29 - 30, have previously been cancelled.

Allowance of all Claims (1- 12, 14 - 28, 31) is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Dang not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned attorney at 845-452-5863, to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

 Respectfully submitted,
Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg # 37,761